



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,650	11/28/2000	William D. Huse	06271.0024.DVUS01	5769

22930 7590 06/17/2002

HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE LLP
BOX 34
1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

KETTER, JAMES S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2002

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,650

Applicant(s)

HUSE ET AL.

Examiner

James Ketter

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1636

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The invention of the instant claims is dawn to a product, i.e., a VL or VH polypeptide recite as made by a particular method, and more narrowly, to a VL or VH polypeptide which is "capable of having a catalytic activity." However, the structure of an antibody or one of the chains thereof, is variable, as is and was well known in the art. The binding specificity of each different antibody is determined by its precise structure, which is turn is determined by the amino acid sequence of said antibody. Thus, there is a structure-function relationship which determines the specificity of an antibody. However, that relationship is and was insufficiently understood in the art to permit the structure of an antibody polypeptide to be known au priori based solely on its binding specificity. The genus of possible antibody sequences is immense, and although a number of antibody polypeptide sequences were known in the art, the inability of the art to develop a theory which related structure and function in antibodies (and indeed the entire protein art) renders such a sample of sequences inadequate to serve as a representative sample. As such, it would not have been apparent to one of skill in the art that Applicants were in possession of the full scope of the claimed invention at the time of filing.

With further respect to the claims reciting that the claimed VH or VL polypeptide is

Art Unit: 1636

“capable of having a catalytic activity”, the structural features which would be associated with the function of catalytic activity were even less understood in the art than the overall structure-function relationship for antibodies. As such, it would have been even less clear to one of skill in the art that Applicants were in possession of the full scope of the claimed invention at the time of filing.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 16, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Huston et al. (A, newly cited).

The instant claims are drawn to VH or VL polypeptides.

Huston et al. Teaches, e.g., as summarized in the Abstract, that purified VH and VL polypeptides were known in the prior art.

While it is noted that said polypeptides are claimed as products-by-process, it is not apparent that the recited process by which the polypeptides are made would impart any properties to said polypeptides which would distinguish them from those known in the prior art.

Art Unit: 1636

Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sastry et al. (U, newly cited).

The instant claims are drawn to VH or VL polypeptides which are “capable of having a catalytic activity.”

Sastry et al. teaches generally, as shown in the Abstract, VH polypeptides having catalytic activity, which polypeptides had been cloned from the immune repertoire of mice.

While it is noted that said polypeptides are claimed as products-by-process, it is not apparent that the recited process by which the polypeptides are made would impart any properties to said polypeptides which would distinguish them from those known in the prior art.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 17, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase “capable of having a catalytic activity” is unclear. It might be understood to mean that the polypeptide does possess catalytic activity by itself, or that it does not now possess such activity but would under certain (unspecified) conditions, or that it could be modified to give it such catalytic activity.

Art Unit: 1636

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted directly to the Examiner by facsimile transmission at (703) 746-5155. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(see 37 CFR ' 1.6(d)). To send the facsimile to the Art Unit instead, the Art Unit 1636 Fax number is (703) 305-7939. NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax to this number, the Examiner must be notified promptly, to ensure matching of the faxed paper to the application file, and the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014 may be used without notification of the Examiner, with such faxed papers being handled in the manner of mailed responses. Applicant is encouraged to use the latter two fax numbers unless immediate action by the Examiner is required, e.g., during discussions of claim language for allowable subject matter. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner with respect to the examination on the merits should be directed to James Ketter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1169. The Examiner normally can be reached on M-F (9:00-6:30), with alternate Fridays off.


Questions regarding formalities and processing of the case should be directed to Zeta Adams, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3291.

Art Unit: 1636

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, can be reached at (703) 305-1998.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

Jsk
June 15, 2002



**JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER**